



18 MAY 2003

David Fox
Fullbright & Jaworski
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100
Houston, Texas 77010-3095

In re Application of :
BACHYNSKY et al. :
U.S. Application No. 09/744,622 :
PCT No.: PCT/US99/16940 :
Int. Filing Date: 27 July 1999 :
Priority Date: 27 July 1998 :
Attorney Docket No.: HO-P01615W00 :
For: CHEMICALLY INDUCED :
INTRACELLULAR HYPERTHERMIA :

DECISION ON PETITION
UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(b)

This is a decision on applicants' "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.47(b)" filed 27 November 2002 to accept the application without the signature of the inventors, Nicholas Bachynsky and Woodie Roy. No petition fee is due.

BACKGROUND

On 27 July 1999, applicants filed international application no. PCT/US99/16940 which claimed a priority date of 27 July 1998. A proper Demand was filed with the International Preliminary Examining Authority prior to the 19th month from the earliest claimed priority date. Accordingly, the thirty-month time period for submitting the requisite basic national fee in the United States of America was extended to expire 30 months from the priority date, i.e., 29 January 2001.

On 26 January 2001, applicants filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States, which was accompanied by the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1) and a copy of the international application.

On 12 March 2001, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed. The notification set a one-month time limit in which to respond.

On 05 September 2001, applicants filed "Petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.47(b)" and a three-month extension of time. The petition was dismissed in a Decision dated 08 November 2001.

On 07 May 2002, applicants filed Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.47(b) and a four-month extension of time. The petition was dismissed in a Decision dated 27 November 2002.

On 27 November 2002, applicants filed the present petition.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the requisite petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i); (2) factual proof that the inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort; (3) a statement of the last known address of the nonsigning inventor; (4) an oath or declaration executed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant on behalf of and as agent for the nonsigning inventor; (5) proof of proprietary interest in the application; and (6) a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damages. The 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has satisfied the requirements of items (1),(2),(3), (4) and (6). However, item (5) has not been satisfied.

A review of the present petition and the accompanying papers reveal that applicant has satisfied item (2), in that the applicant has shown that a bona fide attempt was made to present the application papers, including the specification, claims, and drawings to Nicholas Bachynsky and Woodie Roy. The steps taken by G. Wayne Choate are sufficient to show that the missing inventors refuse to execute the application.

Concerning Item (5), section 409.03(f) of the M.P.E.P., **Proof of Proprietary Interest**, states, in part:

When an application is deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must prove that (A) the invention has been assigned to the applicant, or (B) the inventor has agreed in writing to assign the invention to the applicant, or (C) the applicant otherwise has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application.

If the application has been assigned, a copy of the assignment (in the English language) must be submitted. The assignment must clearly indicate that the invention described in the 37 CFR 1.47(b) application was assigned to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. A statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) by the assignee must also be submitted (see MPEP § 324). An assignment of an application and any "reissue, division, or continuation of said application" does not itself establish an assignment of a continuation-in-part application. In re Gray, 115 USPQ 80 (Comm'r Pat. 1956). An assignment to a 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant for the sole purpose of obtaining a filing date for a 37 CFR 1.47(b) application is not considered an assignment within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 118 and 37 CFR 1.47(b).

When an inventor has agreed in writing to assign an invention described in an application deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), a copy of that agreement should be submitted. If an agreement to assign is dependent on certain specified conditions being met, it must be established by a statement of facts by someone with first hand knowledge of the circumstances in which those conditions have

been met. A typical agreement to assign is an employment agreement where an employee (nonsigning inventor) agrees to assign to his or her employer (37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant) all inventions made during employment. When such an agreement is relied on, it must be established by a statement of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

If the invention has not been assigned, or if there is no written agreement to assign, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must demonstrate that he or she otherwise has a sufficient proprietary interest in the matter.

A proprietary interest obtained other than by assignment or agreement to assign may be demonstrated by an appropriate legal memorandum to the effect that a court of competent jurisdiction (federal, state, or foreign) would by the weight of authority in that jurisdiction award title of the invention to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant. The facts in support of any conclusion that a court would award title to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant should be made of record by way of an affidavit or declaration of the person having firsthand knowledge of same. The legal memorandum should be prepared and signed by an attorney at law familiar with the law of the jurisdiction involved. A copy (in the English language) of a statute (if other than the United States statute) or a court decision (if other than a reported decision of a federal court or a decision reported in the United States Patents Quarterly) relied on to demonstrate a proprietary interest should be made of record.

Regarding Item (5), petitioner has not demonstrated that applicant has a proprietary interest in the invention. Petitioner has provided an Assignment executed by Nicholas Bachynsky and Woodie Roy. As stated in the previous petition, the assignments of the "invention" to Texas Pharmaceutical, Inc., show sufficient proprietary interest, however, the assignments are not acceptable to establish ownership and file the application under 37 CFR 1.47(b). The assignments do not identify the instant application by application number or title of the invention. (See 37 CFR 3.21 and MPEP 302.03) While the invention in the sales agreement, the assignment, and the instant application appear to be related matter, they do not appear to cover the identical subject matter. Applicant has stated that the description of the invention sold in the sales agreement are identical to the invention and assignment recorded under the priority document. However, applicant has not stated that the priority document and the instant application are identical. As stated above, when an application is deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must prove that, as of the date the application is deposited in the Patent and Trademark Office, (1) the invention has been assigned to the applicant, or (2) the inventor has agreed in writing to assign the invention to the applicant, or (3) the applicant otherwise has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application.

For the reasons stated above, it would not be appropriate to accept the application without the signature of Nicholas Bachynsky and Woodie Roy under 37 CFR 1.47(b) at this

time.

CONCLUSION

The renewed petition filed under 37 CFR 1.47(b) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(b).

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration
Telephone 703-308-6314
Fax: 703-308-6459